BDAC FINANCE WORK GROUP Meeting Summary September 30, 1998

Attending:

NCPA	Eric Hasseltine	BDAC
Calif Farm Bureau Fed	Brice Bledsoe	CVPWA
USBR	Randall Neudeck	MWD
Western Water Company	Wendy Illingworth	Foster Associates, Inc
EBMUD	Dean McLeod	USACE
USACE	Steve Ritchie	CALFED
SEWD	Kathy Mannion	WGA
LWVC/BDAC	Byron Buck	CVWA
Calif. Research Bureau	Chris LaFranchi	independent
UCB	Mike Myatt	CALFED
Senate CALFED Committee	Julia Maclay	San Diego CWA
	Calif Farm Bureau Fed USBR Western Water Company EBMUD USACE SEWD LWVC/BDAC Calif. Research Bureau UCB	Calif Farm Bureau Fed USBR Randall Neudeck Western Water Company EBMUD USACE SEWD LWVC/BDAC Calif. Research Bureau Brice Bledsoe Randall Neudeck Wendy Illingworth Dean McLeod Steve Ritchie Kathy Mannion Byron Buck Chris LaFranchi

Brief Summary:

The group went over the new Draft Financing Plan. Some of the issues that were raised included:

- Re: Crediting, the Work Group generally agreed that credit should be given for CVPIA
 Restoration fund money spent on CALFED actions after the signing of the Bay-Delta
 Accord. There was disagreement over whether the crediting policy should also apply to
 water given up from the CVPIA and the Accord, and some question over other actions that
 may or may not be given credit (such as money spent on Conservation and Recycling
 efforts).
- Re: Fish Screens, the question was raised whether fish screens were considered a benefit or mitigation. It was pointed out that this decision would have impacts on the cost share for fish screens.
- Re: Financial Baseline, Roberta Borgonovo strongly disagreed with the idea to leave the door open for the possibility of some public funding for the ecosystem portion of storage.
- Re: User fees, it was questioned whether or not it would be possible to resolve all of the specifics surrounding user fees prior to the R.O.D., as was implied in the Draft Financing Plan.

- Re: Water transfers, there was general consensus that \$20 mill/year to obtain water for the environment would not negatively alter/distort the water market. However, the issue was raised that perhaps during dry years the market could be distorted if money was available to purchase water for the environment with virtually no cap on what price could be paid for the water. Eric Hasseltine expressed concern that it doesn't make sense to be opposed to new storage, with a portion of storage for the environment, yet be in favor of spending \$20 million/year for a water market. If the objective is more water for the ecosystem, then obtaining that water through the most cost-effective means should be the goal.
- Re: Area of origin rights, the issue was raised that area of origin rights need to be taken into consideration and possibly added to the Needs of Affected Parties section.
- Re: Water rights, the question was asked whether or not pre-1914 water rights would be
 taken into account in the financing plan. The decision had been made previously by the
 Work Group to do a first-cut cost allocation before taking into account the specifics
 surrounding water rights and ability to pay.
- Re: Program cost estimates, Steve Ritchie went over the tables for each program area and answered questions about the assumptions and methods used to obtain the numbers. It was suggested that if someone questions the numbers (i.e., claims they are too high or too low) for specific program areas or actions, it would be helpful to CALFED staff if these arguments were backed up with specifics as to what the numbers should be, and why. The same applies to cost shares for the program.